United Nations A/71/747–S/2017/38

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
16 January 2017

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-first session
Agenda item 32
Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

Security Council
Seventy-second year

Identical letters dated 12 January 2017 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia on the destruction by the Russian occupation forces in Abkhazia, Georgia, of the multi-layered, archaeological and architectural monument — the settlement site, tombs and ruins of the church dating from the eighth to ninth centuries and late middle ages, as well as a graveyard from the mid-twentieth century (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex issued as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 32, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Elene **Agladze**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.
Deputy Permanent Representative

17-00668 (E) 180117

Please recycle

Annex to the identical letters dated 12 January 2017 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Statement issued on 10 January 2017 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia

According to Russian and Abkhaz sources, on 3 January 2017, the Russian occupation forces in the Abkhazia region destroyed the multi-layered, archaeological and architectural monument — the settlement site, tombs and ruins of a church dating from the eighth to ninth centuries and late middle ages, as well as a graveyard from the mid-twentieth century — while preparing the ground for a military shooting range in Tsebelda, Gulripshi district.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs condemns another act of damaging the monuments of the historical and cultural heritage of Georgia by the occupation regime as an act directed against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia and calls upon the Russian Federation to desist from the practice of damaging and destroying Georgian cultural monuments in the occupied territories. This illegal act once again demonstrates the grave military and humanitarian situation in the occupied territories of Georgia.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Georgia warns the Russian Federation that the intentional damage inflicted to the cultural heritage sites violates the provisions of international humanitarian law, notably the 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, as well as the principles of the 2003 Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

The Ministry also calls upon the international community, UNESCO and other international organizations to duly assess the illegal actions of the Russian Federation and to spare no efforts to save and protect historical and cultural heritage in the occupied territories of Georgia.

United Nations A/71/748–S/2017/41

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
17 January 2017

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-first session
Agenda item 31
Prevention of armed conflict

Security Council
Seventy-second year

Letter dated 19 December 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon the instructions of my Government, I am hereby transmitting for your attention the record of ceasefire violations by the Azerbaijani armed forces during the month of November 2016 (see annex I).*

I am also transmitting for your attention the record of ceasefire violations registered by the Ministry of Defence of the Nagorno Karabakh Republic during the month of November (see annex II).*

I kindly request that the present letter and its annexes be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 31, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Zohrab **Mnatsakanyan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

* The annexes are being circulated in the language of submission only.

17-00749 (E) 190117

Please recycle

Annex I to the letter dated 19 December 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Violations of the ceasefire by the armed forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan along the State border with the Republic of Armenia

1-30 November 2016

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
1 November	**Tavush Region**	1	PK: 30
	Vazashen	1	
2 November	**Tavush, Vayots Dzor, Ararat Regions**	3	AK: 13
	Berkaber	1	
	Khachik	1	
	Yeraskh	1	
3 November	**Ararat Region**	1	AK: 1
	Yeraskh	1	
4 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	17	AKM: 365
	Chinari	9	PK; RPK: 56
	Aygedzor	2	SVD: 42
	Aygepar	3	Black Arrow: 25 (Chinari 25)
	Movses	1	
	Koti	1	
	Paruyr Sevak	1	
5 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	4	AK: 14
	Chinari	1	PK: 20
	Paravakar	1	
	Yeraskh	2	
6 November	**Tavush, Ararat, Syunik Regions**	9	AK: 16
	Chinari	2	PK; RPK: 33
	Yeraskh	6	SVD: 3
	Agarak	1	
7 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	4	AKM: 5
	Vazashen	2	PK: 3
	Yeraskh	1	
	Paruyr Sevak	1	
8 November	**Tavush, Gegharkunik, Ararat Regions**	3	AK: 10
	Aygehovit	1	PK; RPK: 45
	Vahan	1	
	Yeraskh	1	

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
9 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	5	AK: 17
	Chinari	1	
	Aygehovit	2	
	Yeraskh	2	
10 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	4	AK: 29
	Aygedzor	1	
	Paravakar	1	
	Yeraskh	2	
11 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	23	AK: 136
	Aygedzor	2	PK: 176
	Chinari	4	SVD: 48
	Paravakar	2	DShK: 10
	Aygepar	3	Black Arrow: 29 (Chinari 20; Paravakar 3; Vazashen 6)
	Movses	1	
	Vazashen	3	
	Berd	1	
	Yeraskh	7	
12 November	**Tavush, Gegharkunik, Ararat Regions**	9	AK: 58
	Aygedzor	1	PK; RPK: 10
	Chinari	2	DShK: 30
	Chambarak	1	
	Yeraskh	5	
13 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	6	AK: 10
	Aygedzor	1	PK; RPK: 31
	Paravakar	1	SVD: 4
	Movses	3	
	Yeraskh	1	
14 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	7	AK: 10
	Aygedzor	1	PK: 3
	Paravakar	1	
	Yeraskh	4	
	Paruyr Sevak	1	
15 November	**Tavush, Gegharkunik, Ararat Regions**	5	AK: 5
	Aygedzor	1	PK: 50
	Chambarak	1	SVD: 4
	Yeraskh	3	Black Arrow: 5 (Aygedzor 5)

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
16 November	**Gegharkunik, Ararat Regions**	6	AK: 6
	Chambarak	2	PK: 45
	Pambak	1	DShK: 70
	Yeraskh	3	Istiglal: 8 (Chambarak 8)
17 November	**Tavush Region**	3	AK: 30
	Aygedzor	2	RPK: 10
	Aygehovit	1	SVD: 5
18 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	29	AK: 161
	Aygedzor	8	PK; RPK: 464
	Chinari	11	SVD: 84
	Aygepar	2	DShK: 168
	Movses	3	Black Arrow: 25 (Aygedzor 25)
	N.Karmiraghbyur	1	
	Yeraskh	3	
	Paruyr Sevak	1	
19 November	**Tavush Region**	5	AK: 18
	Chinari	1	SVD: 2
	Aygedzor	2	
	Berkaber	2	
20 November	**Tavush, Ararat Regions**	2	AK: 4
	Cinari	1	
	Yeraskh	1	
21 November	**Tavush, Syunik Region**	3	AK: 229
	Berdavan	1	PK: 274
			SVD: 52
	Karchevan	2	Istiglal: 2 (Mehdili 2)
22 November	**Tavush Region**	5	AK: 18
	Aygedzor	2	PK: 15
	Aygepar	1	SVD: 2
	Kayanavan	2	
23 November	**Gegharkunik, Ararat, Syunik Regions**	4	AK: 43
	Geghamasar	1	PK: 20
	Yeraskh	2	
	Arevis	1	
24 November	**Ararat Region**	1	AK: 1
	Yeraskh	1	

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
25 November	**Tavush, Gegharkunik, Ararat Regions**	14	AKM: 167
	Chinari	6	PK; RPK: 311
	Aygedzor	3	SVD: 72
	Movses	2	
	Jil	1	
	Yeraskh	2	
26 November	**Tavush, Ararat Region**	3	AK: 1
	Chinari	2	PK; RPK: 24
	Yeraskh	1	
27 November	**Tavush Region**	5	AK: 89
	Chinari	3	PK: 3
	Barekamavan	1	Black Arrow: 1 (Barekamavan 1)
	Berdavan	1	
28 November	No incidents		
29 November	**Tavush Region**	2	AK: 1
	Movses	1	PK: 15
	Kayan	1	
30 November	**Ararat Region**	1	AK: 3
	Yeraskh	1	

Annex II to the letter dated 19 December 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Violations of the ceasefire by the armed forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the line of contact with the Nagorno Karabakh Republic

1-30 November 2016

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
1 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	39	AK: 428 PK: 379 SVD: 14 RPG-7: 3 (Talish 3) Hand grenade: 4 (Talish 4) Istiglal: 3 (Verin Chaylu 3)
2 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	30	AK: 345 PK: 128 SVD: 14 DShK; Utyos: 49 RPG-7: 5 (Talish 5) Istiglal: 32 (m. Karachuk 1; Kengerli 6; Talish 5; Verin Chaylu 20)
3 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	23	AK: 211 PK: 140 SVD: 18 Istiglal: 2 (Leonarkh 2) Mortar 60mm: 2 (Tallish 2) GP-25: 4 (Tallish 4)
4 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	26	AK: 312 PK; PKT: 131 SVD: 62 DShK: 16
5 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	29	AK: 267 PK; RPK: 322 SVD: 15 Istiglal: 10 (Talish 10)
6 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	23	AK: 171 PK: 283 SVD: 27 DShK: 3

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
7 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	20	AK: 417 PK: 331 Mortar 60 mm: 1 (Tallish 1)
8 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	22	AK: 248 PK: 107 SVD: 6 Istiglal: 42 (Qarvend 35, Verin Chaylu 7)
9 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	33	AK: 445 PK: 142 SVD: 9 RPG-7: 1 (Tallish 1) Istiglal: 59 (Seysulan 50; Verin Chaylu 3; Talish 2; Dastagir 4) Black Arrow: 3 (Jraberd 3)
10 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	34	AK: 292 PK: 223 SVD: 43 Istiglal: 25 (Mehdili 11; Nuzger 5; Shikhlyar 6; Yarmja 3)
11 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	42	AK: 728 PK: 226 SVD: 115 DShK:13 RPG: 4 (Verin Chaylu 4) Istiglal: 24 (Kurapatkino 5; Shikhlyar 8; Bash Karvend 1; Talish 1; Gyulistan 9) 60 mm mortar: 1 (Verin Chaylu 1)
12 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	49	AK: 146 PK: 208 SVD: 55 DShK: 55 Istiglal: 31 (Mehdili 2; Shikhlyar 2; Geytape 18; Bash Karvend 5; Gyulistan 4) Black Arrow: 1 (Shikhlyar 1) 60 mm mortar: 13 (Yarmja 6; Talish 7) 80 mm mortar: 56 (Yarmja 21; Shurabad 3; Levonarkh 32)

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
13 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	50	AK: 175 PK: 178 SVD: 12 DShK; Utyos: 113 RPG-7: 9 (Verin Chaylu 9) Istiglal: 21 (Nuzger 3; Mehdili 1; Korgan 2; Shikhlyar 5; Bash Karvend 3; Gyulistan 7) 60 mm mortar: 17 (Yarmja 5; Verin Chaylu 4; Talish 8)
14 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	34	AK: 524 PK: 270 SVD: 31 DShK: 25 AGS-17: 5 (Gyulistan 5) Istiglal: 10 (Nuzger 5; Mehdili 3; Verin Chaylu 2) 60 mm mortar: 1 (Yarmja 1) 82 mm mortar: 2 (Seysulan 1; Yarmja 1)
15 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	62	AK: 659 PK: 470 SVD: 82 DShK: 50 GP-25: 1 (Talish 1) Istiglal: 26 (Mehdili 14; Nuzger 7; Jraberd 5) Mortar 60 mm: 3 (Yarmja 3) Mortar 82 mm: 4 (Yarmja 1; Tallish 3)
16 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	65	AK: 325 PK: 531 SVD: 19 DShK; Utyos: 144 GP-25: 1 (Talish 1) RPG-7: 1 (Verin Chaylu 1) Istiglal: 37 (Mehdili 8; Seysulan 21, Talish 2; Gyulistan 6) Mortar 60 mm: 15 (Yarmja 1; Talish 14) Mortar 82 mm: 5 (Talish 5)
17 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	27	AK: 163 PK: 81 SVD: 27 Istiglal: 16 (Shikhlyar 3; Seysulan 13)

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
18 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	71	AK: 1945 PK: 375 SVD: 68 DShK: 28 Istgial: 13 (Mehdili 6; Kurapatkino 4; Seysulan 2; Gjulistan 1)
19 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	37	AK: 417 PK: 135 SVD: 23 DShKI; Utyos: 77 Istiglal: 40 (Mehdili 10; Seysulan 8; Yarmja 5; Jraberd 3; Gyulistan 14)
20 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	29	AK: 242 PK: 239 SVD: 10 DShK: 36 Istiglal: 46 (Mehdili 6; Ashaghi Seydakhmedli 3; m. Karachuk 7; Yarmja 10; Gyulistan 20) 60 mm mortar: 1 (Seysulan 1)
21 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	38	AK: 229 PK: 274 SVD: 52 Istiglal: 2 (Mehdili 2)
22 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	29	AK: 208 PK: 381 Istiglal: 14 (Mehdili 2; Shikhlyar 1; Seysulan 11)
23 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	15	AK: 178 PK: 330 SVD: 6 Istiglal: 20 (Mehdili 9; Nuzger 11)
24 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	36	AK: 245 PK: 22 SVD: 27 Istiglal: 14 (Shikhlyar 14)
25 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	39	AK: 404 PK: 415 SVD: 36 Istiglal: 42 (Mehdili 6; Shikhlyar 26; Seysulan 2; Gyulistan 8)

Date	*Direction*	*Incidents*	*Type of weapons/shots*
26 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	18	AK: 177 PK: 30 SVD: 12 Istiglal: 14 (Shikhlyar 14)
27 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	52	AK: 861 PK: 797 SVD: 84 DShK; NSVP: 315 RPG-7: 1 (Kurapatkino 1) Istiglal: 36 (Nuzger 2; Mehdili 1; Horadiz 4; Kurapatkino 2; Shikhlyar 27) 60 mm mortar: 1 (Kurapatkino 1)
28 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	28	AK: 239 PK: 57 SVD: 25 RPG-7; AGS-17: 7 (Kurapatkino 7) Istiglal: 24 (Kurapatkino 5; Jraberd 16; Seysulan 3)
29 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	27	AK: 326 PK: 218 SVD: 2 Utyos: 30 AGS-17: 1 (Ashaghi Seydakhmedli 1) Istiglal: 31 (Mehdili 6; m.Karachuk 2; Shikhlyar 17; Sarijanli 3; Verin Chaylu 3)
30 November	On the line of contact between the armed forces of Nagorno Karabakh Republic and Azerbaijan	30	AK: 158/18 PK: 72 SVD: 26 DShK: 36 AGS-17: 6 (Kurapatkino 6) Istiglal: 64 (Nuzger 3; Kurapatkino 18; Yusifjanli 20; Marzili 3; Shikhlyar 19; Seysulan 1) Black Arrow: 4 (Taghibeyli 4) 60 mm mortar: 10 (Kurapatkino 10)

11 November

1. At 1540 hours in the vicinity of the village of Shikhlyar, on the line of contact, soldier Khosrov Abgaryan was wounded by shrapnel from the Azerbaijani side.

14 November

1. At 1145 hours in the vicinity of the village of Jraberd, on the line of contact, soldier Gevork Dadasyan was wounded from the Azerbaijani side.

2. At 1830 hours in the vicinity of the village of Talish, on the line of contact, soldier Hovhannes Hovhannisyan was wounded by shrapnel from the Azerbaijani side.

15 November

1. At 1320 hours in the vicinity of the village of Talish, on the line of contact, soldiers Zaven Khachatryan and Sasun Stepanyan were wounded by shrapnel from the Azerbaijani side.

18 November

1. At 2340 hours in the vicinity of the village of Mehdili, on the line of contact, soldier Hayk Adamyan was wounded from the Azerbaijani side.

27 November

1. At 1245 hours in the vicinity of the village of Karakhanbeyli, on the line of contact, soldier Armen Ghazaryan was wounded by shrapnel from the Azerbaijani side.

2. At 1655 hours in the vicinity of the village of Marzili, on the line of contact, soldier Kadjik Badalyan was wounded from the Azerbaijani side.

3. At 1745 hours in the vicinity of the village of Jraberd, on the line of contact, soldier Karapet Mikayelyan was wounded from the Azerbaijani side.

United Nations A/71/749–S/2017/42

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
18 January 2017

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-first session
Agenda items 31 and 39

Prevention of armed conflict

Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba

Security Council
Seventy-second year

Letter dated 12 January 2017 from the Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I am writing to you in relation to the letter dated 21 November 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council (A/71/627-S/2016/986).

Azerbaijan has developed a practice of misusing every opportunity to level unsubstantiated allegations against Armenia and mislead the international community. The communication from Azerbaijan is a stark manifestation of attempts to justify its continuing blockade, renewed aggression and incessant hostility against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Armenia's inputs to the annual report of the Secretary-General entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba" (A/71/91) are based on established facts. The replies by the Government of Armenia on the topic have been consistently provided for many years with identical or similar language, which reflects the fact of a continued policy of unilateral coercive measures against Armenia carried out by Turkey and Azerbaijan. While the motives of Azerbaijan's present reaction to Armenia's aforementioned communication to the report of the Secretary-General are obscure, the mere fact that, following years of defiance, Azerbaijan has eventually decided to justify its illegal practice is ironic, to say the least. Azerbaijan's response lacks credibility and integrity. On the one hand, Azerbaijan rejects the imposition of a blockade and a unilateral coercive measure, while on the other hand it tries to justify or even substantiate their existence and necessity by putting forward its

Please recycle

conflict perceptions and protracted allegations. In effect, Azerbaijan confirms the fact of the imposition of a blockade against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Since it is the first communication of Azerbaijan under this particular item, we are compelled to share some reference information to shed light on this important issue.

An economic blockade is a type of unilateral coercive measure, which often refers to economic steps taken by one State to compel a change in the policy of another. The application of such measures as a means of political and economic coercion undermines the sovereignty and independence of the affected States and gravely hampers the full enjoyment of all human rights, including the right to life, the right to development and the right of peoples to self-determination. A number of resolutions of the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council and the former Commission on Human Rights, as well as recurrent political declarations adopted at major international summits and conferences, have reaffirmed that the application of unilateral coercive measures violates the Charter of the United Nations and international law. It could be considered an aggressively hostile act exercised by the blockading nation.

The imposition of the blockade by Azerbaijan and Turkey is in violation of international law and of the purposes and principles of the Charter. It contravenes the basic principles of the multilateral trading system. Furthermore, owing to this blockade, Armenia, as a landlocked developing country, continues to be deprived of its right to freedom of transit and access to sea under the respective United Nations international legal instruments. These coercive measures against Armenia negatively affect the full and effective realization of its development agenda, causing impediments for the implementation of its economic and social policies.

In its communication, Azerbaijan yet again makes a deliberate attempt to deny responsibility for its policies of aggression and blockade. Furthermore, it distorts the facts concerning the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and misinterprets the Security Council resolutions of 1993. In fact, Azerbaijan is in violation of those resolutions, which urge the parties concerned to cease all hostilities and hostile acts with a view to establishing a durable ceasefire, provide unimpeded access for international relief organizations to the civilian population in the affected areas and pursue negotiations within the framework of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) agreed mandate, as well as through direct contacts between them. By resorting to the use or the threat of the use of force and rejecting a number of proposals, including those on confidence-building measures, Azerbaijan obstructs numerous efforts and initiatives undertaken by the Co-Chairs of the OSCE Minsk Group, the only body entrusted with the settlement.

In the world, there exist successful examples of developing economic linkages and building confidence between conflicting parties. Cross-border trade and economic projects have helped to re-establish links between nations, business communities and civil societies and thus contributed to conflict resolution. However, the authorities of Azerbaijan not only prohibit any economic projects and ties with Armenian business and commercial entities, but also strongly discourage and even criminalize people-to-people contacts and interactions between civil society organizations. At the highest political level, Azerbaijan openly declares its

aim to fully blockade Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, which runs counter to the aforementioned Security Council resolutions. The following is just one quote among many from Azerbaijan's incumbent President: "We will continue to isolate Armenia from international and regional projects. This policy is bearing fruit, and the cause for Armenia's difficult economic situation is Azerbaijan." Azerbaijan has been swaying Turkey against the potential normalization of the latter's ties with Armenia. On a number of occasions, the leaderships of both countries have declared that Turkey and Azerbaijan are "one nation, two States", and they unite their efforts towards the marginalization of Armenia.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development has reconfirmed once again that unilateral economic measures as a form of political and economic pressure are detrimental to sustainable development. They significantly increase the costs of import and export, entailing additional costs and an under-realization of the trade and development potential. They also severely hamper transit communication routes, economic cooperation and integration with multilateral trading blocs, and create an essential infrastructure deficit.

Unilateral economic measures cannot stifle the realization of human rights, including the right to self-determination, in any part of the world. The unilateral coercive measures imposed by Azerbaijan and Turkey have not been able to compel the people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh to give up their legitimate aspirations for freedom, independence and development, and this resolute stance will endure and prevail.

I would appreciate it if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 31 and 39, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Zohrab **Mnatsakanyan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

United Nations A/71/750–S/2017/37

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
18 January 2017
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Seventy-first session
Agenda item 34
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Seventy-second year

Identical letters dated 13 January 2017 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

After midnight on 13 January 2017, Israel committed another insidious attack on the Syrian Arab Republic. This was one in a long series of Israeli attacks that have taken place since the beginning of the terrorist war on Syria's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and which were planned in the corridors of Israeli, French, British and American intelligence services and those of their clients in Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Qatar and other countries that wish to extend their control and hegemony over Syria and the region.

Against this background, Israeli aircraft launched a large number of rockets from north of Lake Tiberias that struck the area surrounding the Mazzah airport, causing a fire. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriates has described in correspondence to the Security Council how previous Israeli land and air attacks killed large numbers of innocent civilians, including women, children and the sick, and destroyed infrastructure of various types. Such attacks would not have happened but for the direct support and green light given by the outgoing United States administration and French and British leaders.

All these Israeli attacks against Syria took place at the same time that the armed terrorist groups, whether in the north, the centre or the south of Syria, were being routed. The recent aggression followed the overwhelming defeat of the terrorist Nusrah Front and its allies in eastern Aleppo and the successes that led the terrorists to withdraw from the areas around Damascus. In particular, reconciliation processes took place in Khan al-Shih and in Qunaytirah, Dar'a and elsewhere, crushing the dreams of Israel and its Western allies and their Wahhabi Saudi and Qatari clients. The continued Israeli attacks across the line of separation of forces in Golan, which have been corroborated in the report of the Secretary-General and by the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, are part of a series of Israeli crimes that contravene its obligations pursuant to the separation of forces

Please recycle

agreement. Those reports confirm that Israel has provided its terrorist allies, particularly the Nusrah Front, with all types of Israeli weapons, and has provided medical treatment to more than 1,500 injured members of terrorist organizations at Israeli hospitals — as has been admitted by Israeli leaders — before sending them back to Syria to continue their dirty terrorist war against innocent Syrian civilians. Israel's desperate and open support for terrorist organizations makes it a partner in killing Syrians and destroying their achievements, demonstrating that terrorism and Israel are two sides of the same coin.

The revelation of Israel's role in the terrorist war on Syria and its eagerness to launch terrorist attacks on Syria require the international community, the Secretariat and the Security Council to take immediate action in order to sanction the Israeli aggressor and prevent it from repeating such terrorist attacks, which have catastrophic effects. Not only do they undermine Syrian sovereignty and pose a persistent challenge to Security Council and General Assembly resolutions that call on Israel to withdraw from Palestinian, Syrian and Lebanese territory and halt settlement activity on occupied Syrian and Palestinian land; they also amount to direct support, in violation of all Security Council resolutions, for terrorist organizations in Syria that appear on the Security Council list.

Syria once again warns Israel to halt its repeated attacks on Syrian sovereignty, which will have serious consequences. It will not desist from its obligation to implement the counter-terrorism resolutions of the Security Council, including resolution 2253 (2015). Syria also reiterates that it will not spare any effort toward the peaceful resolution of the Syrian crisis.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriates would be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 34, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mounzer **Mounzer**
Minister Counsellor
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

United Nations A/71/751–S/2017/48

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
19 January 2017

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-first session
Agenda item 31
Prevention of armed conflict

Security Council
Seventy-second year

Letter dated 30 December 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon the instructions of my Government I am transmitting herewith the statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia, dated 29 December 2016, on the diversionary incursion attempt by Azerbaijan into the State border with Armenia, which resulted in the loss of lives (see annex).

I kindly request that the present letter and its annex be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 31, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Tigran **Samvelian**
Charge d'affaires a.i.

17-00854 (E) 230117

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 30 December 2016 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Armenia

29 December 2016

We condemn in the strongest terms today's diversionary incursion attempt by Azerbaijan into the State border with Armenia, which resulted in the loss of lives. We express our deepest condolences to the relatives and fellow servicemen of the fallen soldiers.

While the most serious damage caused to the settlement process as a result of the Azerbaijani aggression against Artsakh (Nagorno-Karabakh) in April 2016 has not yet been overcome, Baku is embarking on a new adventurism grossly violating the agreements reached at the Vienna and Saint Petersburg summits and the commitment to settle the issue through peaceful means. This is how Baku responds to the Foreign Ministers of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Minsk Group Co-Chair countries who urged, in Hamburg, strict adherence to the 1994 and 1995 ceasefire agreements.

On numerous occasions, the international community, through the Co-Chairs, has called to maintain the ceasefire, especially during the holidays. By undertaking military diversionary incursions on Christmas and New Year's Eve, Baku is acting against universal human values.

The international community, first and foremost the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chair countries, should take immediate steps to sober up the Azerbaijani leadership, who has lost the sense of reality and who ignores and opposes with defiance their calls and demands.

United Nations A/71/752

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 January 2017

Original: English

Seventy-first session
Agenda item 115 (h)
Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

Appointment of members of the Joint Inspection Unit

Note by the President of the General Assembly

1. As indicated in paragraph 6 of the note by the Secretary-General of 21 July 2016 (A/71/178), the General Assembly will need to fill the vacancies that will arise upon the expiry of the term of office of Mr. Gopinathan Achamkulangare (India), Mr. Gennady Tarasov (Russian Federation), Mr. George Bartsiotas (United States of America), Mr. Jean Wesley Cazeau (Haiti) and Ms. Sukai Elie Prom-Jackson (Gambia) in December 2017. Also, as indicated in paragraph 1 of the note by the Secretary-General of 9 November 2016 (A/71/178/Add.1), the General Assembly, at its 29th plenary meeting, on 14 October 2016, decided to fill one vacancy in the Joint Inspection Unit for a term of office beginning on 1 January 2017 and expiring on 31 December 2021, which resulted from the resignation of Mr. George Bartsiotas (United States of America) with effect from 30 September 2016.

2. In accordance with the procedures described in article 3, paragraph 1, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit and pursuant to General Assembly resolution 61/238, the President of the General Assembly, at the 45th plenary meeting, on 10 November 2016, having consulted Member States and having drawn up a list of countries from among the Group of African States, the Group of Asia-Pacific States, the Group of Eastern European States and the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, requested the Gambia, Haiti, India and the Russian Federation to propose candidates (see annexes I-IV) to serve for a period of five years beginning on 1 January 2018.

3. The candidates, in accordance with paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 59/267, should have experience in at least one of the following fields: oversight, audit, inspection, investigation, evaluation, finance, project evaluation, programme evaluation, human resources management, management, public administration, monitoring and/or programme performance, in addition to knowledge of the United Nations system and its role in international relations.

17-00882 (E) 270117

Please recycle

4. The President of the General Assembly has held the consultations described in article 3, paragraph 2, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit, including consultations with the President of the Economic and Social Council and with the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chair of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination. The replies received from the President of the Economic and Social Council and from the Secretary-General to identical letters addressed to them on 11 November 2016 by the President of the Assembly are attached (see annexes V and VI).

5. Having completed the required consultations, the President of the General Assembly has the honour to submit to the Assembly the following candidates for appointment as members of the Joint Inspection Unit for a five-year term beginning on 1 January 2018 and expiring on 31 December 2022:

Ms. Sukai Prom-Jackson (Gambia)
Mr. Jean Wesley Cazeau (Haiti)
Mr. Gopinathan Achamkulangare (India)
Mr. Nikolay Lozinskiy (Russian Federation)

Annex I

Note verbale dated 11 June 2016 from the Permanent Mission of the Gambia to the United Nations addressed to the United Nations Secretariat

The Permanent Mission of the Gambia to the United Nations has the honour to inform the Secretariat of the United Nations that the Government of the Gambia has decided to submit the candidature of Ms. Sukai Prom-Jackson for re-election as a member of the Joint Inspection Unit for the period 2018-2022, at the elections to be held in November 2016.

Ms. Prom-Jackson is a recognized global expert on development evaluation, education and institutional development. She has an extensive background in policy research, strategic planning and management. Her candidature for re-election is based on the premise that, although she has already positively contributed to the work of the Joint Inspection Unit, she intends to continue to build on the progress made and enhance the ability of the Unit to respond to demands from Member States as well as to apply effective modalities for an integrated evaluation function and approach of the Unit.

Attachment

Sukai E. Prom-Jackson (Gambia)*

A. Overview

Over 30 years of experience in international development, including work in over 30 developing countries and in addressing regional and global issues.

Currently **as Inspector of the Joint Inspector Unit of the UN system** (JIU): Dr. Prom Jackson has focused her work on supporting reforms for the quality, relevance, and sustainability of the evaluation function of the UN system for governance and improvement. She led the analysis of the UN system function for evaluation and for results based management; and serve as JIU Lead Inspector for the General Assembly policy for Independent System-Wide Evaluation (ISWE) of operational activities for development. A commitment to national capacities for evaluation has led her to publish articles with the Africa Development Bank and to provide advisory support to the World Bank Center for Learning on Evaluation and Results for Africa.

Prior to the JIU, she worked for **7 years as senior staff and manager at the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office** and member of the United Nations Evaluation Group. Key accomplishments were in: the management and conduct of complex evaluations of operational activities for development, the development of evaluation policies, and the development of capacities to enhance quality and rigor in UNDP and UN system evaluations. Dr. Prom-Jackson also led training on evaluation for staff of United Nations system and partners all over the world.

Prior to her work at UNDP, Dr. Prom Jackson worked for **15 years at the World Bank** on diverse assignments, including: research and policy formulation; strategic planning, program and project design and management for lending operations; program management and the coordination of partnerships for the non-lending strategy of the Bank. She also established the policy, mechanism and modalities for the evaluation of the Bank's professional training program and trained evaluators, mangers, and national partners.

Past experiences in the USA and The Gambia (1974-1990) included: Oversight of university and regional research and evaluation centers funded by USA government; university lecturer and thesis adviser; management consultant; the conduct of research on minorities with policy implications; the development and management of the USA Peace Corps program in The Gambia; support for development of Gambia Government policies and strategies for education and examinations; and teacher in The Gambia.

Throughout her professional experience, **she has participated in a wide range of regional and global initiatives and professional networks on evaluation** including lead roles in the Network of Networks for Impact Evaluation (NONIE), OECD/DAC Peer reviews of evaluation functions, and multilateral effectiveness reviews.

* Curricula vitae are issued without formal editing.

B. Academic qualifications

- Doctor of Philosophy: Educational Psychology, focus on policy research, measurement, evaluation, and human development. Howard University, Washington D.C USA, 1982
- Master of Education: Strategic planning, program development and teaching, Howard University, Washington D.C. 1978
- Bachelor of Arts: History and French. Middlebury College, Vermont, USA. 1974

C. Work experience and accomplishments

Summary 1: EVALUATION, RESEARCH, MEASUREMENT, INSPECTION Her experience in this area spans over 25 years developing evaluation policies, developing and managing research and evaluation programs, and conducting a wide range of studies significant for accountability, policy development, institutional change, and program improvement. This work has been done at the JIU, UNDP, the World Bank, the United States Government as well as at universities in the USA.

1.1. Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations System, Inspector (2013-2017)

She has been an Inspector for three years carrying out the JIU mandate for evaluation, inspection and investigation. Her greatest accomplishments to date have been in taking a lead role in the following areas that have represented core challenges of the JIU and have been part of the reform agenda of the JIU:

- Enhancing the JIU leadership role in evaluation and in advancing the results agenda thereby enhancing effective governance, direction setting and transformation of the United Nations system;
- Advancing the work of the JIU beyond a focus on organizational effectiveness to examining UN system contribution to development effectiveness in order to enhance the difference the UN system makes;
- The development of new mechanisms to enhance partnership, outreach and visibility of the JIU thereby enhancing the utility and added value of its products to support decision-making; and
- The development of rigor in methods for assessment and analysis in JIU studies to enhance credibility of its reports.

In her work at the JIU, she gives a clear focus to system-wide analyses (as opposed to single organization analyses) and she has led two JIU reports and co-authored two others to include: Analysis of the Evaluation Function of the UN system (2014); Benchmarking framework for system-wide assessment of the RBM; System-wide Review of managing for results (2016); System-wide Review of Implementing partners (2013); and System-wide Review of Decent work (2014).

She is currently the JIU Lead Inspector for the General Assembly initiative on Independent System-wide Evaluation of Operational Activities for Development (ISWE). In this role and as Chair of the Interim Coordination Mechanism for the policy and having lead substantive as well as coordination roles in the conduct of

the pilot evaluations, she seeks to enhance the development of an appropriate and viable function for managing and conducting independent system-wide evaluation of development activities to support the decision making capacities of legislative and governing bodies. This initiative implies an expansion of the traditional role of the JIU focused on performance assessments of organizational and institutional effectiveness and presents many opportunities for enhancing the reform and relevance of the JIU for supporting development effectiveness.

In her role as Inspector, Ms Prom Jackson has sought to seize opportunity to engage with UN system stakeholders with the aim of enhancing the relevance, ownership, and use of JIU reviews. In this regard, she has responded to several invitations for presentations to Board members, and UN staff. This has included presentations at UNESCO, WIPO, ECE, Visiting OSCE delegation to Geneva, and the Swiss Evaluation Society annual conference, as part of the 2015 International Year for Evaluation.

Besides her work on JIU projects, she takes an active role in the quality assurance of all JIU products and has played a role in enhancing methodological rigor of JIU products.

1.2 UNDP Evaluation Office, Senior Evaluation Adviser and Manager (2005-2012)

As a member of the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office Management Team and as Coordinator of methodology, quality enhancement, partnerships and knowledge management, she worked with senior managers, team leaders, and coordinators over a period of 7 years to enhance the relevance, credibility, independence and leadership role of the Independent Evaluation Office to include the following.

Development of the evaluation function of UNDP:

- Developed a common institutional framework for the evaluation function in UNDP through: the development of the first UNDP evaluation policy (2006) and its approval by the UNDP Executive Board; developed operational guidelines and procedures and handbooks for policy implementation thereby enhancing consistency and coherence; enhanced capacity for the implementation of the evaluation policy by leading training of staff and managers, conducting regional workshops and other activities for mainstreaming evaluation in the UNDP programming cycle and in organizational tools and instruments.
- Provided support for organizational accountability through (a) the development of the UNDP annual report on evaluation, including informal discussion and follow-up discussions with the Executive Board; and (b) the development of informational management systems for tracking compliance for purposes of evaluation planning and following up management responses to evaluation.
- Enhanced the quality of the evaluation function and its alignment and comparability with other global evaluation functions by taking a lead role in the UN system pilot peer review of the UNDP evaluation function by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC).

Enhancing the sustainability and systems operations of the evaluation function:

- Established quality criteria and mechanism for the quality assurance of decentralized evaluation units and for reporting on quality of evaluation for institutional action to improve quality.
- Led dialogue on ways to enhance sustainability of the evaluation function by supporting efforts to enhance the capacity of various regional evaluation associations, with a focus on the African Evaluation Association.
- Took lead role in initiating the conference on national evaluation capacity with a strategy which seeks to enhance ownership of the project by evaluators and stakeholders from the various regions.

Managing the evaluation office to achieve results:

- Defined the strategic directions of the office and key result areas and deliverables; Monitored implementation of the work program and made the necessary adjustments in staffing, workload and resource allocation; Addressed corporate requirements and demands for accountability and improvement and provided advice on the response of the Independent Evaluation Office to institutional issues for both UNDP and UN system reform agenda for managing for results and for coherence.
- Led the work of the Evaluation Office on the methodology for enhancing the quality and credibility of its evaluations and complex evaluations in particular. This included working with key external experts on evaluation; conducting evaluations to serve accountability and learning as well as to develop methodologies for strategic evaluations including thematic evaluations, country level evaluations, and impact/effectiveness evaluations.
- Represented the Independent Evaluation Office in a wide range of international meetings and workshops addressing development evaluation, aid effectiveness, and development effectiveness and established partnerships.
- Enhanced linkage of the central evaluation function with the UNDP organizational strategy and carried out various corporate responsibilities, including: reviews of the evaluation policies of other United Nations agencies; participation in human resource interview panels, development of an accountability mechanism (including the balanced scorecard), and serving as a focal point for the Associated Funds and Programmes (UNCDF, UNV), and the UNDP Capacity Development Group.

Coordinator of special initiatives on evaluation in partnership with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and other professional networks:

The UNDP Evaluation Office plays a major leadership role in advancing development evaluation and the use of appropriate evaluation methods. In this regard, she played a lead role 2005 to 2009, as described below:

Task Team Leader of UNEG — system-wide evaluation and coherence

- Worked with members of UNEG to define the guiding principles and methodology for a country-led joint evaluation of the United Nations system in South Africa; led the pre-scoping mission focused on clarifying the demand for the evaluation, defining a partnership framework, costing the evaluation and developing a financing plan.
- Worked with UNEG and the South African Department of Foreign Affairs on a process of engaging the Government in the evaluation as a basis for ensuring quality and utility and for defining the framework for the scoping mission and plan for the management and conduct of the evaluation. The conduct of the evaluation was carried out by another team.

Task Team Leader of the UNEG — Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation (NONIE/3ie)

- Served as the liaison between UNEG and the Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation: Served as UNDP liaison with the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) to define a strategic direction for impact evaluation at the global level, and to lead the work on the development of qualitative impact evaluation.

Co-Chair of the UNEG Training Task Force on Evaluation Capacity development

- Develop and implement strategy for training staff of United Nations and partner agencies; Assessment of the capacity of UNEG to implement the training strategy on a sustainable basis; Assessment of a plan for development of e-learning module on evaluation in the Un system; development of framework for partnership with UN Staff College for evaluation on training.

1.3 World Bank, Human Development Network, Senior Education Specialist (2002-2004)

As the lead specialist for measurement and evaluation in the Education Unit of the Human Development Network, she undertook the following:

- Provided: (a) support for the Bank's corporate activities on results measurement and evaluation; (b) training on measurement, research and evaluation to Bank staff and at the international level; and (c) guidance and support to Bank staff involved in implementing the Bank's agenda on results measurement and evaluation.
- Led the development of the results framework for the monitoring and evaluation of the Education for All — Fast Track Initiative, in partnership with key donors; worked with internal and external agencies and donor partners in addressing issues of data quality and accessibility, client capacity-building in measurement and evaluation, and the harmonization of donor efforts on monitoring and evaluation.
- Initiated, together with monitoring and evaluation colleagues, the development of the monitoring and evaluation working group and a work program on impact evaluation, in alignment with the Bank's Development Impact Evaluation (DIME) program.

1.4 World Bank: World Bank Institute Evaluation Group, Senior Evaluation Specialist (1998-2002)

- **Led the development of the first policy and strategy for the evaluation of the staff learning program** to address the key goals of accountability, program improvement and knowledge development.
- Led the Bank-wide review of a system for the governance of the Bank's staff program for professional excellence, establish a sustainable system for evaluation, in partnership with key stakeholders, and planned and managed the conduct of multiple evaluation studies.
- Led the technical upgrading of the system for the measurement of learning processes and outcomes in the Bank's client training program, using both traditional and alternative measurement methods.
- Initiated major conceptual reflections on appropriate types of impact evaluation of diverse products.

Provided technical guidance on formative evaluation to various Bank units.

1.5 United States Government, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Research Associate (1983-1986)

- Developed policies for educational research and evaluation.
- Completed contracts and grant programs, monitored and enhanced their implementation by major research institutions at Harvard University, Yale University and the University of California, Los Angeles, and by regional research laboratories.
- Established liaison among government institutions, research centers and practitioners, and used results to propose national policies and programs.
- Evaluated innovations in education and supported the development of evaluation and assessment systems in selected states.

1.6 District of Columbia Public Schools, Office of Strategic Planning, Research and Accountability, Research Associate (1979-1982)

- Conducted complex evaluations of the effectiveness of nation-wide Federally Funded programs in the United States (Chapter 1 for minorities, and Chapter 2 for innovations in education).
- Conducted and published or made presentations of research studies on culture and cognition, minorities in math and science, teachers and teaching, effective use of instructional time, and home environment and performance.
- Assisted programme directors to enhance the evaluability of their programmes and trained their staff on measurement and evaluation concepts.
- Supervised various research teams addressing a wide range of topics on education.

1.7 Howard University, Lecturer and Graduate Thesis Adviser (1981-1984)

- Taught classes on statistics, research design, evaluation methods, psychometrics, and on learning and cognitive development.

Summary 2: POLICY FORMULATION, STRATEGIC PLANNING, PROGRAMME AND PROJECT DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT (1983-2004) For over 13 years (1984-2004), she stablished or supported the development of policies and strategies for education in the United States of America and Africa and developed and implemented diverse programmes. The following experiences in the World Bank are significant because of opportunities and challenges for partnerships, innovation in difficult change contexts and impact on development.

1.2. Development of policies and strategies

- As Task Manager for an educational sector adjustment programme, initiated with government partners a participatory process in Benin to develop a revised educational policy and strategy to restructure the organization and financing of the sector, and to develop a sector-wide programme for financing by the Bank and other donors (1990-1994). A major highlight of this work was the establishment of a boarding school to address the secondary education of girls. This followed earlier analytical work she had initiated in the Bank on girls' education and development.

- As senior Training Officer, collaborated with the operational policy and country support unit and the Bank's regional senior operations advisers to develop, plan and implement the first integrated curriculum on Bank operations and portfolio management for the Bank's staff and clients (1994-1998)

- Led the development of a comprehensive programme for staff and manager training on the Bank's new lending instruments and on the results-based management framework for project/programme design, monitoring and evaluation; trained and supported Bank staff, managers and clients with regard to the results frame as a participatory tool for planning and for enhancing evaluability (1995-2000).

1.3. Management and coordination

Since 1987, she has managed and coordinated a variety of programs and has developed superior capacity in planning, budgeting, selecting and guiding staff, and the effective delivery of work programmes. Besides the lead and management roles and responsibilities outlined in regard to her current work with UNDP, the work described below is also significant.

<u>World Bank, Human Development Network: Program Coordinator in education, Development Grant Facility and Global and Regional Partnership Programs, and Professional Development Program (2002-2004)</u>

- Developed programme strategy, plans and budget with sector managers for global programmes and partnerships; provided guidance to over 20 task managers and senior staff to ensure quality in project design; and provided

support to staff in identifying and establishing partnerships to address global issues in human development.

- Collaborated across sectors in the Human Development Network in program implementation.

- Represented the unit in the Bank's Knowledge and Learning Board and in the Global Programs and Partnerships Council.

World Bank Institute, Evaluation Unit, Acting Manager (2000-2001)

- Worked with the Director of the Unit to enhance its stability and to develop its business goals, plans and budget for the programme for the evaluation of the training of Bank clients, and supervised a team of over 15 staff as well as specialists in research and evaluation to deliver the Unit's business goals within budget and with high quality.

United States, Peace Corps, Associate Director for Education and Health (Gambia, 1986-1988)

- Led the development of the programme on education and health and enhanced its results focus and strategic relevance. Activities included the following:

  - Evaluated and restructured the education and health programmes.

  - Managed the programmes and supervised over 50 Peace Corps volunteers with graduate degrees and professional experiences in mathematics, science, engineering, public health and community development.

  - Provided assistance to Gambian Government in reformulating education policies and restructuring the national examinations system.

  - Established a wide range of small-scale community projects, in partnership with various non-governmental organization, to enhance local empowerment and, in particular, that of women.

Summary 3: FACILITATION OF LEARNING and TEACHING She has a keen interest in understanding and enhancing people's understanding and development of knowledge and skills; some of her experiences in this area are highlighted above and can be summarized as follows.

- Studied cognitive science, culture and cognition, and ethnographic psychology as one basis for understanding people's knowledge systems, cognitive schemas and learning styles, and how this guides thought processes, behaviours and performance.

- Taught and facilitated learning and behavioural change among various populations: children, adolescents, university students, directors, programme managers, practitioners, researchers and evaluators.

- Developed an integrated curriculum for high-impact learning and behavioural change, based on a model that links institutional needs, individual needs, performance requirements, incentive systems, the demands of a learning organization and organizational change.

- Participated in the use of high-impact change models, such as Accelerating Results Together, to enhance the development of World Bank policies and programmes for staff excellence as learners and knowledge developers
- Engaged in follow-up activities of summative evaluations, focusing on an analysis of what works, how it works, and why it works.
- Studied and applied formative evaluation models addressing transformative processes, including how people adopt innovations, the change processes they go through and the types of support needed at each stage of the change process.

Annex II

Note verbale dated 21 March 2016 from the Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations addressed to the United Nations Secretariat

[Original: French]

The Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations has the honour to inform the United Nations Secretariat that the Government of Haiti has decided to nominate Mr. Jean Wesley Cazeau for re-election to the Joint Inspection Unit, for the term 2018-2022, at the elections to be held in November 2016.

The nomination had been conveyed to the permanent missions of States Members of the United Nations in December 2014.

Attachment

Jean Wesley Cazeau (Haiti)*

[Original: French]

I. Experience

1 January 2013 to date	Geneva: Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations System
6 July 2012-28 December 2012	New York: Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations
	Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative
10 November 2011-5 July 2012	New York: Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations
	Permanent Representative-designate
October 2005-10 November 2011	New York: Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations
	Ambassador/Deputy Permanent Representative
March 2005-October 2005	New York: Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations
	Minister Counsellor, representative to the Fifth Committee and alternate to the Second Committee
March 2003-March 2005	New York: Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations
	Counsellor, representative to the Fifth Committee and alternate to the Second Committee
August 2001-March 2003	Port-au-Prince, Haiti: Centre d'Etudes Secondaires (High School)
	Educational adviser
	Principal
March 2003 to date	Educational adviser
March 1997-March 2003	Port-au-Prince: Centre d'Etudes Diplomatiques et Internationales

* Curricula vitae are issued without formal editing.

	Educational adviser
	Professor
March 2003 to date	Educational adviser
February 1998-March 1999	Port-au-Prince: Center for Free Enterprise and Democracy (CLED)
	Deputy Executive Director
May 1995-February 1998	Port-au-Prince: International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Programme (ICITAP) — Training Centre of the National Police of Haiti
	Consultant/Translator
	Cultural broker
December 1994-April 1995	Port-au-Prince: Mirabreak (GB Group)
	Director/Chief of Staff
September 1992-June 1994	Washington, D.C.: Howard University
	Teacher of French
August 1991-August 1992	Sabbatical year
April 1989-July 1991	Washington, D.C.: Embassy of Haiti
	Counsellor in charge of administrative and consular affairs
	Alternate delegate to the Organization of American States
February 1986-March 1989	Washington, D.C.: Embassy of Haiti
	First Secretary in charge of administrative and consular affairs. Alternate delegate to the Organization of American States
October 1985-January 1986	New York: Permanent Mission of Haiti to the United Nations
	First Secretary
October 1984-December 1985	Port-au-Prince: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cults
	First Deputy Director of the Office of International Institutions, Congresses and Conferences

February 1980-September 1984	Port-au-Prince: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cults

II. Education

1992-1994	Washington, D.C.: Howard University
	Master's degree in Foreign Languages and Modern Literature; minor subject: International Relations
1986-1988	Maryland, United States of America: Montgomery College
	English Proficiency 1986-1988
1977-1982	Port-au-Prince: Institut national d'administration de gestion et des hautes études internationales (INAGHEI)
	International Relations and Political Sciences
1980-1982	Port-au-Prince: Union School
	English Proficiency

III. Seminars

1982	Port-au-Prince: Multinationals in Developing Countries (INAGHEI)
July 1986	Washington, D.C.: Organization of American States: The Third World and Diplomacy
November 1989	Washington, D.C.: American Laws and Consular Procedures
August 1990	Washington, D.C.: Department of State: International Relations
July 1998	Port-au-Prince: Business Association Training (Center for International Private Enterprise/CLED)

Annex III

Letter dated 4 February 2016 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly

I have the honour to inform you that the Government of India has decided to present the candidature of Mr. Gopinathan Achamkulangare to the Joint Inspection Unit for the period 2018-2022 at the elections to be held in November 2016. Mr. Gopinathan Achamkulangare is currently the Chair of the Joint Inspection Unit for the year 2016, being a member for the period 2013-2017.

(*Signed*) Syed **Akbaruddin**

Attachment

Gopinathan Achamkulangare (India)*

January 2013 till date: Inspector, Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations system, Geneva

January 2009-December 2011: Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations offices in Geneva

November 2005-January 2009: Ambassador of India to Egypt

January 2002-September 2005: Deputy Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations in New York

August 1997-December 2001: Joint Secretary, United Nations Division, Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi; dealing with Human Rights and humanitarian issues; Environment, Climate Change and sustainable development; Elections and Candidatures; UN Funds and programmes; Specialised Agencies, and other economic and social issues dealt with by various UN Bodies and other international organisations.

August 1993-July 1997: Deputy High Commissioner in Mauritius

November 1990-August 1993: First Secretary/Counsellor, High Commission of India, Colombo, Sri Lanka

February 1987-September 1990: First Secretary (Economic), Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations, New York

June 1984-January 1987: Under Secretary/Deputy Secretary (Administration), Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi

November 1981-June 1984: Second Secretary, Embassy of India, Doha

September 1979-August 1981: Third Secretary, Embassy of India, Cairo

July 1977-September 1979: Attaché, Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi

UN experience:

January 2013 till date: Inspector, Joint Inspection Unit of the United Nations system, Geneva

Authored two reports: a review of the resource mobilization function across the United nations system (2013) and review of the management and administration review of the office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (2014)

Co-authored several reports: appointment and support to the resident coordinators (2013); cooperation among UN Regional Commissions (2014) and currently ongoing review of the management and administration of the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) and fraud prevention, detection and response across the United Nations system.

Chair of the working group on internal working procedures since June 2013.

* Curricula vitae are issued without formal editing.

January 2009-December 2011: Permanent Representative of India to the UN and other international organisations in Geneva:

UN Human Rights Council (12th to 20th sessions from March 2009 to September 2011); associated sessions of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and other meetings related to human rights;

Meetings WIPO, WHO, ILO and other Specialised Agencies in Geneva (January 2009-December 2011); especially negotiations on the pandemic influenza preparedness framework and medicinal products of questionable quality, safety and efficacy;

Appointed by the President of the Human Rights Council as a Facilitator on the agenda and programme of work of the Human Rights Council for the review of the Council, December 2010 to June 2011;

Appointed by the President of the Human Rights Council as a member of the Consultative Group for selection of the Special procedures Mandate Holders of the Council, July 2010 to June 2011;

Meetings of the Reflection Group on the review of functioning of the Human Rights Council (Paris, January 2010; Rabat, May 2010; and Seoul, July 2010): The Algiers Retreat (February 2010) and the Bangkok Retreat (December 2010) on the HRC review; the Third Budapest Human Rights Forum (October 2010);

Co-ordinator of the Asian group in the Human Rights Council, 2009-'10;

Durban Review Conference on racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, Geneva, April 2009; and,

The Global Forum on Migration and Development (Athens, November 2009 and Puerto Vallarta, Mexico 2010).

January 2002 to September 2005: Deputy Permanent Representative of India to the UN, New York

57th, 58th and 59th sessions of the UN General Assembly; and the summits, high-level events and plenary meetings devoted to specific themes during this period;

ECOSOC sessions in 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005;

Co-ordinated Indian participation in UN Peace-keeping Operations, ranging from negotiating the Memorandum of Understanding and Letters of Assist to deployment and logistics;

Co-ordinated Indian participation in the work of the Counter-terrorism Committee and Indian submissions to the CTC;

Sessions of the preparatory meetings and the 2005 World Summit, New York, September 2005;

Discussions on UN reform among G-16 countries, Stockholm, March 2005;

Conference on sustainable development of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), Mauritius, January 2005;

UNCTAD-XI at Sao Paulo, Brazil, in June 2004;

International Ministerial Conference of landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit-Transport Cooperation; Almaty, Kazakhstan, August 2003; and,

Preparatory meetings for the World summit on sustainable development ['Rio plus ten' conference] in Johannesburg [2002].

August 1997 to December 2001: Joint Secretary (UN Economic and Social), Ministry of External affairs, New Delhi:

52nd, 53rd, 54th, 55th and 56th sessions of the UN General Assembly;

54th, 55th, 56th and 57th sessions of the UN Commission on Human Rights (CHR) in 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 respectively;

Fourth to Eighth sessions of the Conference of Parties to the UN Convention on Climate Change and its subsidiary bodies (Buenos Aires in November 1998; Bonn in October-November 1999, The Hague in November 2000, Marrakesh, Morocco in November 2001 and New Delhi in November 2002), including as spokesperson of the Group of 77 on the mechanisms of the Kyoto Protocol at the seventh session in Morocco;

UN Conference on racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance: Durban, South Africa, September 2001;

The Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, Brussels, May 2001;

Preparatory meeting of the Asian group for the World conference against racism, Tehran, February 2001;

Preparatory meetings of the Convening Group and the first Ministerial conference of the Community of Democracies, Warsaw, June 2000;

Special session of the UN General Assembly on the review of the implementation of the outcome of the World Social Summit (Copenhagen plus five), Geneva, June 2000;

Regional workshop on National Human Rights Action Plans; Bangkok, July 1999;

The Seventh Asia-Pacific Workshop on Regional Co-operation for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, New Delhi, February 1999;

Special session of the UN General Assembly on Narcotic Drugs, New York, June 1998; and,

UNESCO's World Conference on Cultural Policies for Development, Stockholm, March/April 1998.

February 1987 to September 1990: First Secretary (Economic), Permanent Mission of India to the UN, New York:

The Second Committee of the UN General Assembly at its 42nd, 43rd and 44th sessions;

Economic aspects of the work of the Economic and Social Council from 1987 to 1990, including during India's Presidency of ECOSOC in 1990;

Governing Council of UNDP and its subsidiary bodies from 1987 to 1990, including the allocation of resources for the Fifth Programming cycle;

Inter-governmental bodies of the UN, including subsidiary organs of the General Assembly and ECOSOC in the economic field, from 1987 to 1990;

Negotiations of the General Assembly resolution 44/228 which launched the preparatory process for the Rio Earth summit and the first meeting of the preparatory committee (1989-'90);

Special session of the UN General Assembly on International Economic Co-operation and its preparatory committee (1988-'90);

Member of the inter-governmental Group of Experts of the Governing Council of UNDP to advise on the successor arrangements to the agency support cost regime (1989-'90);

Preparatory committee of the International Development Strategy for the Third UN Development Decade (1988-'90);

Member of the Committee of Experts on the Perez Guerrero Trust Fund of the Group of 77 (1988-'90); and,

UNCTAD-VII in Geneva in July 1987.

Papers, articles and presentations:

The Arab spring: challenges and need for support for transition to democracy [Brookings event at Greentree, New York; Nov. 2012]

The Arab spring: supporting transition to democracy [Indian Foreign Affairs Journal Oct.-Dec. 2012; pages 423-432]

India and negotiations on Climate Change [Sept. 2012]

India's foreign policy: overview and challenges [Sept. 2012]

The Arab spring and India [Sept. 2012]

Global Governance and the United Nations [UN Staff College, Turin; Aug. 2012]

Global Internet Governance and India [FICCI: Aug. 2012]

India-Egypt relations: problems and prospects [Aug. 2012]

India and Global Internet Governance [RIS, July 2012]

India, Africa and the case for UN reforms [May 2012]

"Towards a more equitable outcome from Rio plus 20" [RIS; April 2012]

The Arab spring and democracy [Wilton park conference, Istanbul; April 2012]

Contemporary challenges to multilateralism and global governance [April 2011]

Medicines of questionable quality, safety and efficacy: current challenges and long-term solutions — a public health perspective [October 2010]

Economic development in Africa: South-South cooperation: Africa and the new forms of development partnerships: the Indian experience [UNCTAD, Geneva; September 2010]

New challenges in multilateral governance [The Graduate Institute, Geneva; May 2010]

Expert Meeting on Trade and Climate Change: Trade and Investment Opportunities and Challenges under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM): the Indian experience [UNCTAD, Geneva; April 2009]

New directions in India-Africa relations [Egyptian Council of Foreign Affairs, Cairo; May 2008]

The prospects for strengthening India-Egypt relations [Cairo; Feb. 2008]

Towards the 2005 World Summit: The year of UN reform? [May 2005]

Emissions reduction: beyond the first commitment period [May 2004]

Johannesburg and beyond: towards concrete action [March 2002]

Climate Change as a survival imperative: implications for international relations [the National Defence College, New Delhi; July 2000]

The international politics of Human Rights [the National Defence College, New Delhi; July 1999]

Annex IV

Letter dated 17 January 2017 from the Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations addressed to the President of the General Assembly

I have the honour to confirm the candidature of Mr. Nikolay Lozinskiy for appointment to the Joint Inspection Unit for the term 2018-2022 in accordance with the decision taken by the General Assembly at the main part of its seventy-first session.

(*Signed*) Vitaly **Churkin**

Attachment

Nikolay Lozinskiy (Russian Federation)*

Date of birth:	2 January 1956
Languages:	Russian (mother tongue), English, Spanish

Professional experience

2013-Present	Deputy Director, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2008-2013	Head of Administrative and Budgetary Division, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2004-2008	Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva, Head of Administrative and Budgetary Section
2003-2004	Head of Division, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2001-2003	Senior Counsellor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
1996-2001	Counsellor, Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations in New York, Head of Administrative and Budgetary Section, Representative of the Russian Federation to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly
1993-1996	Head of Division, Department of International Organizations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
1990-1993	Third Secretary, Second Secretary, First Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
1984-1990	United Nations Secretariat, New York

Membership in multilateral bodies

2006-2007	Member of the Coordinating Committee on Remuneration
2008-2011	Member of the Group of Experts on Financial and Administrative Matters of UNESCO and representative of the Russian Federation in the Staff Pension Committee of UNESCO

* Curricula vitae are issued without formal editing.

2011-present	Member of the Independent Advisory Oversight Committee of the World Intellectual Property Organization
2012-present	Member of the UN Committee on Contributions
2014-present	Member of the Budget Committee of the Council of Europe
2014-present	Member of the Advisory Group of the Preparatory Commission of the CTBTO
2014-present	Member of the Advisory Body on Administrative and Financial Matters of the OPCW

Participation in international meetings and conferences of multilateral bodies

General Assembly (Fifth Committee)

Committee for Programme and Coordination

Governing Council of the United Nations Compensation Commission

Executive Board and World Health Assembly of the World Health Organization (WHO)

Governing Body and International Labour Conference of the International Labour Organization (ILO)

Council of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

Programme and Budget Committee and Assemblies of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

Executive Council of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction

Executive Board and General Conference of UNESCO

Council and Assembly of the International Maritime Organization (IMO)

Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO)

Arctic Council task force for institutional issues

Education

1978-1983	Diploma in International Economic Relations, Moscow State Institute of International Relations

Annex V

Letter dated 15 November 2016 from the President of the Economic and Social Council addressed to the President of the General Assembly

I have the honour to write to you in response to your letter of 11 November 2016 regarding consultations held with the Chairs of the regional groups to appoint members to fill four vacancies on the Joint Inspection Unit that will occur on 31 December 2017.

I wish to inform you, in my capacity as President of the Economic and Social Council, as provided for in article 3, paragraph 2, of the statute of the Joint Inspection Unit and in accordance with paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 59/267 of 23 December 2004, that I have reviewed the qualifications of the proposed candidates and I have the pleasure to inform you that I am in full agreement with the proposal to nominate Ms. Sukai Prom-Jackson (Gambia), Mr. Jean Wesley Cazeau (Haiti), Mr. Gopinathan Achamkulangare (India) and Mr. Nikolay Lozinskiy (Russian Federation).

(*Signed*) Frederick **Shava**

Annex VI

Letter dated 19 December 2016 from the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chair of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination addressed to the President of the General Assembly

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 11 November 2016 regarding the proposed appointment of four inspectors of the Joint Inspection Unit effective 1 January 2018.

In accordance with article 3, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Joint Inspection Unit, and following consultations with members of the United Nations system Chief Executives Board for Coordination, I have the pleasure to inform you that, in my capacity as Chair of the Chief Executives Board, I concur with the appointment of the following four candidates:

Ms. Sukai Prom-Jackson (Gambia)
Mr. Jean Wesley Cazeau (Haiti)
Mr. Gopinathan Achamkulangare (India)
Mr. Nikolay Lozinskiy (Russian Federation)

I would, however, appreciate it if you could convey to the Joint Inspection Unit the hope of the Board that renewed attention and consideration will be given to gender balance for future nominations.

(*Signed*) **BAN** Ki-moon

United Nations A/71/753

General Assembly

Distr.: General
19 January 2017

Original: English

Seventy-first session
Agenda item 148
Financing of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals

Construction of a new facility for the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, Arusha branch

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report is the sixth progress report on the construction of a new facility for the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, Arusha branch, and is submitted pursuant to paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 70/258. It provides an update on the project since the issuance of the previous report of the Secretary-General (A/70/698).

During the period since the previous report, the construction of the facility was substantially completed, on 1 December 2016. The project is now in the post-occupancy phase, which includes a 12-month defect liability period. The new facility has been occupied by the Mechanism since 5 December 2016.

The project remained within the approved overall budget, with a projected balance of $455,814 in the contingency provision. The use of local labour, materials and capacity was maximized throughout the project duration, in particular during the construction.

The project team continued to monitor the project closely, with the guidance of the Office of Central Support Services. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) carried out an audit of the effectiveness of the management of the construction phase and assigned a rating of "satisfactory".

Following the timely completion of the pre-construction phase, construction began on 27 February 2015 and was scheduled to last 12 months. Owing to technical difficulties on site, construction was completed on 1 December 2016. The Mechanism, in consultation with the Office of Central Support Services and the Office of Legal Affairs, has begun and will continue to explore options to pursue appropriate recovery of direct and indirect costs arising from delays, where economically feasible, pursuant to paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 70/258, and the outcome will be reported in future reports on the budget of the Mechanism.

17-00847 (E) 260117

Please recycle

I. Introduction

1. The project for the construction of a new facility for the Arusha branch of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals commenced in January 2012, following the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 66/240 A. In that resolution, the Assembly decided to appropriate an initial amount of $3 million to cover expenses related to the conceptual design phase of the project. In its resolution 67/244 B, the General Assembly authorized the activities related to all phases of the construction of the facility and authorized the Secretary-General to establish a multi-year special account for the project. In its resolution 68/257, the General Assembly appropriated an additional amount of $5.8 million, approving a total of $8.8 million for the project.

2. Five previous progress reports have been submitted, outlining, inter alia, the project expenditure and costs, as well as the implementation of the requests and recommendations of the General Assembly. The present report constitutes the sixth progress update. It describes the progress made since the previous report (A/70/698) and provides updated information on the use of local knowledge and capacity in implementing the project, application of lessons learned, mitigation of risks, efficiencies, utilization of resources and updated expenditure and projected cost to completion.

3. This project comprises new premises to house the Mechanism in Arusha. The facility includes the first purpose-built archive building of the United Nations, containing the records of historic international criminal proceedings conducted by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. In its courtroom, the Mechanism is expected to try the last three accused of the Tribunal, who still remain at large and are considered to be among those most responsible for the genocide and other international crimes committed in Rwanda in 1994. This solemn facility, where traditional architectural elements and local material blend with specialized technology, is set to become a landmark in the region and beyond.

4. Substantial completion of the project was successfully achieved on 1 December 2016. This marked the conclusion of the construction phase and the beginning of the post-occupancy phase. The new facility is fully operational and has been occupied by the Mechanism since 5 December 2016.

5. The project remained within the approved budget of approximately $8.8 million, inclusive of the contingency provision. The contingency provision has a projected balance of $455,814. As the approved scope of the project has now been delivered, no further drawdown of the project contingency funds is envisaged. The unused portion of the contingency provision, including any unencumbered balance against the projected expenditures for 2017, would be taken into account and reported in the second performance report on the budget of the Mechanism for the biennium 2016-2017.

6. Local capacity and knowledge have been a crucial asset to the project since its inception. The use of local resources increased further during the construction phase, with labour, raw materials and signature finishes coming from the United Republic of Tanzania and the region.

7. Local knowledge co-existed in the project with the global knowledge accumulated by the United Nations in capital projects, as passed on to the Mechanism through the constant guidance of the Office of Central Support Services. The experience of the project will also add to the Organization's rich repository of lessons learned, to guide best practices.

8. To date, no safety, ethical or environmental risks in relation to the project have materialized, thanks to proactive risk management and the cooperation of all stakeholders.

9. The Secretary-General is grateful to the host State, the United Republic of Tanzania, without whose generosity and active coordination with the project team, the new facility would not exist.

10. The project was initially estimated to be completed in five years and three months, with a completion date in the first quarter of 2017 (A/66/745). While the actual occupancy was achieved ahead of this initial deadline, a delay was experienced in the revised project length, which had been reduced from five to four years, in response to a request from Member States, with a reduction of 15 months from the original timeline, as indicated in the fifth progress report (A/70/698). This was due to the slower-than-expected progress on site on account of the late delivery of the curtain wall and exterior windows. The timely shipment and delivery of the curtain wall was one of the risks identified in the fifth progress report. While fully under the responsibility of the contractor, the project team, together with the Office of Central Support Services, worked collaboratively with the contractor and the architects to identify and implement mitigation measures, described in greater detail below.

11. At the time of writing, the Mechanism had begun to consider the contractual remedies that are available to the United Nations to recover direct and indirect costs arising out of delays in the construction project.

12. The following are the main activities undertaken since the previous report:

(a) The project has continued to benefit from the close cooperation between the Mechanism and the host State, the United Republic of Tanzania. The final electrical utility connection and the Internet and telecommunication connection offered by the host State were completed at no cost to the United Nations. On 25 November 2016, the facility was opened by the Vice-President of the United Republic of Tanzania;

(b) Construction works carried out by Tanzanian contractor Jandu Plumbers Ltd. continued to progress on site, with the completion of the critical structural element of the curtain wall and the fit-out of interior and exterior areas;

(c) In early October 2016, testing and commissioning commenced;

(d) Following the conclusion of testing and commissioning, the project reached substantial completion on 1 December 2016;

(e) The Mechanism organized the move into and occupancy of the new premises. The facility has been occupied by the Mechanism since 5 December 2016 and is fully operational;

(f) OIOS concluded its audit of the effectiveness of the management of the construction phase, which resulted in an overall "satisfactory" rating, and began an audit of the post-construction phase, which is ongoing;

(g) The Mechanism continued to manage the project in consultation with its partners and stakeholders, in particular the Office of Central Support Services. During the reporting period the Mechanism continued to: (i) monitor risks and identify mitigation measures; (ii) include local knowledge and capacity; (iii) apply best practices and lessons learned; (iv) promote closer co-operation and communication amongst stakeholders; (v) liaise with neighbouring institutions; (vi) strengthen the project's regulatory framework; and (vii) exercise tight financial control;

(h) The Mechanism, in close coordination with the Office of Legal Affairs, the Procurement Division of the Office of Central Support Services and OIOS, commenced examining the options for the appropriate recovery of direct and indirect costs arising out of delays which may be attributable to the Mechanism's contractual partners, where economically feasible, pursuant to paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 70/258.

II. The new Mechanism premises

13. The facility serves as the new premises for the Mechanism in Arusha. Key elements of the design and the overall project scope have remained consistent with those presented in the second progress report (A/67/696), aligned with the programmatic objectives of the Mechanism, including its staffing and operational requirements. The facility revolves around a single, prominent tree, representing justice in many parts of Africa, placed at the centre of the courtyard paved with local stones from the Tanzanian coastal city of Tanga. Three buildings face onto the courtyard — the office, the archives and the courtroom. The buildings are minimalistic and multipurpose, reflecting the Security Council's vision of the Mechanism as a lean and efficient institution. Annex I to the present report contains pictures of the substantially completed premises.

14. The compound is situated within the gently sloping terrain and benefits from the natural strengths of the site. The facility blends highly specialized technology with references to traditional architectural elements from the region, found, for instance, in the conical shape of the courtroom as well as the natural stone paving comprising the open courtyard.

15. The facility takes into full consideration the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The entire compound, including the public areas and all buildings, are wheelchair-accessible.

Sustainability features

16. The design adheres to best practices for sustainable building in the design and construction industry. The facility was designed to minimize the consumption of energy, water and other resources, and, consequently, the long-term operating costs and emission of greenhouse gases.

17. Given the mild climate of the region throughout the year, the office building uses natural ventilation, with air conditioning only in meeting rooms and the three Principals' offices. The mild climate, coupled with the prevalence of masonry and reinforced concrete construction methods, allowed the project to make use of thermal mass to reduce dependence on artificial forms of heating and cooling, thereby reducing energy consumption. Notably in the archives building, which has stringent air temperature requirements, thick walls are used to capture heat from the sun during the day which is naturally stored in the mass of the walls to keep the air temperature inside the building warm at night. The process is reversed during the day, when the thick walls shield the indoor environment as the sun heats up the outdoor air. Additionally, the facility is equipped with an energy-efficient heating, ventilation and air-conditioning system.

18. The facility LED lighting system is also energy-efficient. To further reduce energy consumption, motion sensors have been installed in the archive repositories, the courtroom building and the bathrooms in each building; solar lights have been positioned in the courtyard and in the parking areas; and the security perimeter lights have been fitted with photocells.

19. An environmental impact assessment was conducted for this project, as reported in the previous report of the Secretary-General (A/69/734). The report concluded that no significant environmental impacts were expected as a result of the construction activities. During this phase, the contractor developed and implemented an environmental mitigation plan, and abided by relevant domestic regulations. As of substantial completion of the project, no negative environmental impact was observed by the architects, the project team or the host State.

III. Project management

A. Stakeholders

Project team

20. The project team is primarily responsible for the overall coordination and oversight of the project. The Assistant Secretary-General, then Registrar of the Mechanism, served as the project owner from the inception of the project until 31 December 2016, and managed it actively and closely. The Registrar was assisted by the Head of Registry, Arusha branch, and the project manager, who played a crucial role in coordinating the contribution of multiple stakeholders towards completion, monitoring risks and ensuring full adherence to United Nations rules and regulations.

21. The composition of the project team has remained unchanged since the hiring of the project manager in the planning phase, in April 2013. This ensured the consistency and continuity required to deliver the project successfully. As of 1 January 2017, the team is headed by the current registrar of the Mechanism, and the responsibilities of the project manager, who completed her assignment on 31 December 2016, are assumed by the Head of the General Services Unit, who is responsible for the Mechanism's facility management in Arusha. An appropriate handover has been undertaken, and continuity will be further strengthened by the technical guidance of the Office of Central Support Services and the Head of

Registry, Arusha branch. The defect liability period, which commenced as of 1 December 2016, will be managed by a team of the Mechanism's regular staff comprised of the Registrar, the Head of Registry and the Head of the General Services Unit, Arusha branch.

Host State

22. Cooperation between the Mechanism and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania has been excellent throughout the project. The Secretary-General expresses his deep appreciation for the unwavering support from the Government and its officials, without which this project would have not been realized.

23. The host State graciously offered 16 acres of undeveloped land for the Arusha premises at no cost to the United Nations, of which approximately five have been developed. The remaining undeveloped area is an asset to the site, particularly for security reasons. Additionally, the host State provided an access road, as well as connection to water, electricity and the Internet, also free of charge to the United Nations. During the reporting period, the final electrical utility connection, the Internet and telecommunications connections were completed. The exemption of the contractor from value added tax and import duties for the project has proceeded smoothly. Implementation details of the exemption for the subcontractors and the United Nations were being finalized at the time of writing.

24. The cooperation with the host State has also been strengthened by frequent formal and informal contacts between the Mechanism and various government representatives, including through visits to the site during the construction phase by senior officials, representatives of host State agencies and technical counterparts.

25. The new facility was opened by the Vice-President of the United Republic of Tanzania, Samia Suluhu Hassan, during a ceremony held on 25 November 2016.

Other stakeholders

26. Since the previous report, the project has continued to receive the technical support of the Mechanism's Legal Team, Archives and Records Section, Public Information Section, Administration and Safety and Security Section. Additionally, technical support was provided on a consistent basis by the Chief of Administration, the Budget and Finance Office, and the Procurement Section of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

27. The United Nations Secretariat, in particular through the Office of Central Support Services and the Office of Legal Affairs, offered technical advice and support throughout this project. The Mechanism and the Overseas Property Management Unit of the Office of Central Support Services continued to liaise on a biweekly basis, but often much more frequently, via videoconferences, conference calls, meetings and correspondence. Owing to the overall intensity of activities during the peak construction period, the then Registrar attended biweekly coordination meetings as of November 2015 and maintained direct contact with the Office of Central Support Services.

Neighbouring institutions

28. Pursuant to paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 70/258, the Mechanism continued to engage with other international organizations and judicial institutions that are expected to move to the vicinity of its new premises, including the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, the African Union Advisory Board on Corruption and the African Institute of International Law. The Mechanism is the first of the institutions to open its new premises, and other projects in earlier stages are looking to the Mechanism for lessons learned and sharing of experiences. The Mechanism remains committed to continuing these discussions as the neighbouring projects advance, with a view to creating synergies and fostering cooperation whenever it is economical, efficient, secure and possible to do so.

B. Governance and oversight

Regulatory framework

29. The Mechanism has developed a rich regulatory framework to guide its operations and promote consistency and oversight for the project. During the reporting period, additional governance instruments were adopted, including a claims procedure, while others were revised, such as the comprehensive project manual, drawing from the global guidelines for the management of construction projects issued by the Office of Central Support Services.

Risk register

30. OIOS found that appropriate measures were in place for identifying, assessing and communicating risks and mitigation measures in both the planning and the construction phases. The risk register, developed at the initial stage of the project, continued to be regularly updated by the project team to incorporate new risks during the course of the project and continued to be reviewed on the basis of changes in circumstances that might have an impact on the identified risks.

31. Pursuant to paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 70/258, during the construction phase, the project team added technical, contractual, operational and financial risks and developed mitigation measures. The risk register was consistently monitored and shared with stakeholders.

Audits

32. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 67/244 B, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) scheduled a three-stage audit process until the immediate post-construction stage. The first formal audit of the project focused on planning and governance in the pre-construction phase and was reported in the previous report (A/70/698). The first audit contained satisfactory comments, including on the procurement of architectural consultancy services, and found no critical or pervasive deficiencies. All the four important recommendations made were promptly closed.

33. The second audit, concluded on 16 February 2016, focused on the effectiveness of the management during the construction phase. The overall result was found to be "satisfactory". The project management was assessed as

satisfactory because the Mechanism had put in place appropriate controls to: (a) monitor the progress of construction and provide regular updates to senior management; and (b) manage relations with stakeholders to ensure that the project met their expectations. OIOS also found the controls over the procurement process for engaging the construction contractor to be generally satisfactory. The two recommendations that were made were promptly closed before the conclusion of the audit.

34. The third, and final, audit of the project, to cover the immediate post-construction phase, is currently under way.

IV. Progress made during the reporting period

A. Construction progress

35. After the completion of the superstructures of the archives, courtroom and ground floor of the office building in early 2016, the contractor completed all remaining works, including the interior and exterior fit-out and finishes; the installation of the electrical and plumbing elements, heating, ventilation and air-conditioning and fire suppression systems; external works, such as the drainage system; the ducting and cabling for electrical and information technology equipment; the installation of perimeter fencing; and landscaping of the courtyard, including transplanting the tree at the centre of the courtyard.

36. As reported in paragraph 50 of the previous report of the Secretary-General (A/70/698), the project continued to be subject to risks that could affect the project schedule, some of which were outside the control of the United Nations and could occur notwithstanding the mitigation measures put in place by the project team. One of these risks was that of delays in the delivery of imported material.

37. This risk materialized with respect to the delivery of the curtain wall (the exterior windows). The curtain wall is a complex structural element of the project, which features prominently in the office building. It comprises interdependent and sequential components that were manufactured by three different companies located in four countries. The components had to be cut and/or assembled in Dar es Salaam and transported to Arusha for installation. The contractor, solely responsible for the curtain wall under the construction contract, hired a subcontractor to design, source and install the curtain wall.

38. The Mechanism and the project architects were informed by the contractor at the end of February 2016 that the curtain wall had been ordered by the subcontractor. However, in April 2016 the Mechanism became aware of delays in the manufacturing and, consequently, in the shipping of key curtain wall components.

39. By the end of August 2016, all components of the curtain wall of the office building, except the glass louvres, had arrived in the United Republic of Tanzania. The installation of the curtain wall in the office building was well advanced by September 2016, with the exception of the glass louvres. These remaining components arrived in early October and were installed thereafter in the office building.

40. The testing and commissioning phase, required for reaching substantial completion, commenced in early October 2016 and continued until November 2016, to allow for all documentation and certificates of test results to be finalized by several specialist installers and subcontractors and submitted to the architects for verification.

41. The complete scope of the project as defined in the report of the Secretary-General (A/66/754) and approved by the General Assembly in its resolution A/64/240 B was delivered as of 1 December 2016. The contractor officially handed over the site to the United Nations on 4 December 2016, and staff members reported for work at the new premises on Monday, 5 December 2016.

42. With substantial completion, the construction phase of the project concluded and the project entered into the post-occupancy/defect and liability phase. This is a 12-month period starting from 1 December 2016, during which the contractor must complete any minor outstanding works or remedy any defective works, as notified by or on behalf of the United Nations. A punch list of existing defective items and minor outstanding works that the contractor must rectify or complete was generated as part of the substantial completion inspection.

B. Continued inclusion of local knowledge and capacity

43. Pursuant to paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 70/258, the project team continued its efforts to include local knowledge and capacity in the implementation of the project.

44. The incorporation of local elements has been a key feature of the project since its early planning phase, and continued even more robustly further to the selection of a well-established Tanzanian contractor, Jandu Plumbers Ltd. Based in Arusha, the contractor has over 50 years' experience in the United Republic of Tanzania and is fully conversant in prevalent local design and construction practices, as well as shipping, importation and sourcing labour and materials in the region. The contractor deployed approximately 200 skilled and casual labourers, and included many women from Arusha and neighbouring communities. The contractor's experience has been a crucial asset to the project.

45. All the raw materials for the project, including cement, sand, gravel and timber, are local. Multiple finishes, such as the signature elements of Tanga stone, limestone and wood, come from various parts of the United Republic of Tanzania. The tree in the courtyard, which constitutes the centrepiece of the project, was also locally sourced. To the extent possible, the design of the facility takes into account local operations and maintenance practices, and generally reduces the amount of equipment to be maintained, for example, by employing passive ventilation in the office building.

C. Lessons learned

46. In accordance with paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 69/276, and in order to meet the objectives of paragraph 6 of resolution 70/258, the project team continued to apply lessons learned and best practices from other capital projects,

including construction at the United Nations Office at Nairobi, the Economic Commission for Africa and United Nations Headquarters.

47. Relevant lessons learned that were applied during the reporting period include:

(a) Adherence to the Office of Central Support Services global guidelines for the management of construction projects, particularly pertaining to the substantial completion phase and the post-construction phase;

(b) Cooperation with the host State in all aspects of the project;

(c) Continuity of the project team throughout the design and construction phases;

(d) Maintenance and implantation of a rigorous and transparent communication plan among stakeholders and risk owners;

(e) Avoidance of changes of scope during the construction;

(f) Early engagement with the facilities management services and development of maintenance requirements;

(g) Due consideration to reutilization of existing furniture and equipment;

(h) Maintenance of a log of lessons learned in the project and lessons learned in other projects that have been applied to the project.

48. Additionally, the project has developed its own lessons learned and best practices, which will benefit other ongoing and future capital projects. Listed below are some of the best practices identified by the project team, which helped with the successful completion of this project:

(a) Where feasible, consideration should be given to developing the conceptual design in-house. Given that project start-up is often a slow process, an in-house design may result in financial savings, shorten the duration of the project and help foster a sense of ownership of the project among all stakeholders from its inception;

(b) Local business presence can be a strong asset to the project and should be required, both for an architect consultant and a construction contractor. Holding seminars on United Nations procurement could help ensure that international as well as local contractors have the requisite knowledge of the process to compete effectively;

(c) Joint meetings, as appropriate, among the United Nations, the contractor and its subcontractors to review status of ordering, delivery and installation should be held to minimize the risk of delays and to identify and develop mitigation measures;

(d) A United Nations coordinator should be on site to coordinate the work of the main contractor and other contractors installing United Nations equipment, if required. This will help minimize the risk of disruptions of each contractor's works;

(e) Cost savings may be achieved by reusing existing assets to the maximum extent possible;

(f) Careful consideration should be given to the timing of the exercise of delay damages, without prejudice to reserving the right to do so as appropriate.

D. Post-construction phase

49. With the achievement of substantial completion, the Mechanism has entered the post-construction phase and has been occupying the buildings since 5 December 2016.

50. As reflected in the previous report of the Secretary-General, shortly after the commencement of works on site, the then Registrar created a dedicated working group to identify and coordinate all actions required to ensure the timely and efficient occupation of the new facility immediately after substantial completion. The Working Group was composed of the then Registrar, the Chief of Administration of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the project team, the Chiefs of Security, Information Technology, General Services and Procurement of the Tribunal, the project manager, Administration and legal officers of the Mechanism in Arusha. The Working Group also received technical guidance and support from the Office of Central Support Services.

51. As the move date approached, the then Registrar also created a dedicated task force within the Working Group to lead the last technical and practical operations on the ground.

52. The Working Group enabled the identification and transfer of reusable assets for the new premises, led the procurement of necessary assets and equipment, identified end users and their requirements, planned for and largely implemented the move of staff, archives and assets, and coordinated the installation of technical equipment under the responsibility of the United Nations. In its second audit of the project, OIOS acknowledged the positive role of the Working Group.

Move

53. The move proceeded smoothly, from 26 November to 5 December 2016, as scheduled. All staff, necessary equipment, digital archives and the library were moved and all are functioning properly. Mechanism staff members were kept regularly informed as to all stages of the move and were provided with guidance in town hall meetings and in writing. Among other things, the process entailed the packing of furniture and equipment from the Mechanism's previous office, the installation of furniture and equipment and the secure transfer of sensitive records. Crucial to the move was the successful transfer and installation of the Mechanism's information and communications technology equipment, which connects onto a single platform at the Mechanism's offices in Arusha, The Hague and Kigali.

54. Due to technical and security requirements, the transfer of the physical archives is scheduled to occur in a phased manner over a period of five weeks in early 2017. Pending their move, the archives remain secure in the previous premises of the Mechanism.

Transition from construction project to building management

55. The Project Manager effected a comprehensive handover to key staff of the Mechanism Administration in Arusha to ensure the smooth transition and continuity of knowledge in the subsequent operation and maintenance of the facility. As part of the handover process, the team in charge of managing the new premises received the

operations and maintenance manual. The Manual includes: the punch list of minor outstanding and defective works; the testing and commissioning results of all equipment, works and systems; user manuals for systems and equipment; certificates of specialist installers, for example, for the firefighting and suppression systems; manufacturers' maintenance recommendations and requirements; warranties and maintenance agreements; official stamped drawings; details of material used; and contact details of all suppliers and manufacturers. Relevant staff were provided with training and orientation for the main systems in the facility. Keys and spare parts were handed over. The General Services Officer of the Arusha branch of the Mechanism assumed his responsibilities as the designated focal point for the project during the defect liability period.

V. Project schedule

56. In accordance with Security Council resolution 1966 (2010), the Mechanism commenced operations at its Arusha branch on 1 July 2012.

57. As regards the construction of a new facility for the Arusha branch of the Mechanism, the project, which commenced in January 2012, was initially estimated to last five years and three months, with occupancy in the first quarter of 2017 (see A/66/754). In response to a request by the General Assembly, the project length was subsequently shortened to four years, with a reduction of 15 months from the original timeline, as reported in the report of the Secretary-General (A/67/696).

58. In line with the revised time frame, the project entered its fourth year with all the activities of the pre-construction phase having been successfully completed. According to the construction contract and the project timeline (see A/69/734), construction works were scheduled to be completed within 12 months, from 27 February 2015.

59. In the previous report of the Secretary-General, however, the actual completion of works was anticipated by May 2016, as a consequence of slower-than-expected progress on site due to a topographical error and site management turnover and consequent quality control issues. It was cautioned in the previous report that the project was still subject to risks that could further affect the schedule, including possible delays in the shipment and delivery of long lead-time material.

60. This risk materialized in the delayed delivery of the curtain wall. While this delay was outside the control of the United Nations, the Mechanism immediately and proactively sought solutions. From April 2016, when the issue surfaced, the Mechanism:

(a) Assisted the contractor to develop an action plan for the sequencing of the curtain wall installation based on the manufacturing and delivery schedules;

(b) Arranged with the contractor, and assisted in directly contacting the suppliers of different components in various countries to seek expedited production;

(c) Offered assistance with logistics for items to be transported by air freight to expedite delivery times;

(d) Maintained close communication with both the contractor and subcontractor, including in several meetings led by the then Registrar;

(e) Continued to brief and seek any appropriate assistance from the host State; and

(f) Helped identify temporary measures to enable continued progress on the fit-out of the interior finishes.

61. The Mechanism regrets this slower-than-expected progress during the construction phase. It continued to spare no efforts, together with the Office of Central Support Services and other stakeholders, towards the most expeditious completion of works, while maintaining the required scope, quality standards, safety requirements and oversight mechanisms. It is noted that substantial completion and occupancy were achieved significantly ahead of the originally estimated completion date set for the first quarter of 2017.

62. A revised project schedule, which takes into account the above, is presented in annex II.

VI. Contracted services

Construction contract

63. Over the reporting period, the project team continued to manage the contract of the construction contractor, Jandu Plumbers Ltd.

64. The contractual timeline for the construction of 12 months shifted from 28 February 2016 to 6 April 2016, owing to the unforeseen topographical error, which halted works for 38 days at the onset of the construction phase, as described in the previous report of the Secretary-General. As this error was not imputable to the contractor, the date of contractual completion for the construction company was extended accordingly.

65. Subsequently, the contractual completion date shifted from 6 April 2016 to 16 May 2016 due to a substitution in the heating, ventilation and air-conditioning system proposed by the contractor. The substitution resulted in a system with better efficiency rating and full after-sale support in the region, at no additional cost to the United Nations. While the substitution was beneficial to the United Nations and was approved, the United Nations was required to undertake an independent review of the proposed substitution in addition to the assessment of the architects. The additional review caused a delay in the contractor's ordering procedures, and the United Nations therefore granted a further extension of the contractual completion date from 6 April to 16 May 2016. The delay in the ordering of the improved heating, ventilation and air-conditioning system had no impact on the actual overall progress or pace of the works on site, as work never stopped during the review of the substitution and the substituted item was required only at a later stage in the project.

66. Nevertheless, the 16 May 2016 contractual completion deadline was not met, owing primarily to extensive delays by the contractor in delivering the curtain wall — or exterior windows for the facility, as described in section IV of the present report. The delay between the contractual and substantial completion dates, where attributable to the contractor, may result in the application of certain contractual remedies, including delay damages, in favour of the United Nations.

67. Pursuant to paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 70/258, the Secretary-General is requested to pursue the recovery of the direct and indirect costs arising from errors and delays, where it is economically feasible to do so. The United Nations intends to exercise such claims for recovery as appropriate, the outcome of which will be reported in the context of future reports on the budget of the Mechanism.

68. In this respect, the Mechanism consulted with the Office of Legal Affairs and the Office of Central Support Services regarding a number of factors, including the timing of such actions. It was agreed that the Mechanism should not seek to invoke the delay damages clause prior to substantial completion of the project, so as not to risk further delay to occupancy and use of the facility by the United Nations. It was therefore agreed that consideration of any such contractual remedies would be best assessed during the post-construction stage of the project.

69. In January 2017, the United Nations notified the contractor that payment for substantial completion would be withheld, pending assessment by the United Nations of any delay damages and additional fees payable by the United Nations to its consultants in connection with the delay. As of the drafting of the present report, discussions between the United Nations and the contractor were ongoing.

Architectural services contract

70. During the reporting period, the project team continued to manage the full architectural services contract with the architectural and engineering consulting firm, Ridge and Partners LLP, operating out of Oxford, United Kingdom, which partnered on the project with a subconsultant, FBW Architects and Engineers Ltd., operating out of Kampala.

71. During the construction phase, the architects provided construction administration and site supervision services, with the assistance of their resident supervisory team. They monitored construction progress and ensured that works met design and quality specifications, reviewed the contractor's material submissions and work programmes, evaluated change orders and substitutions proposed by the contractor and recommended interim payments to the contractor.

72. During the reporting period, three amendments to the architectural contract were executed. The first amendment extended the construction phase by 38 days to account for the delay incurred as a result of the topographical error referred to above, at no cost to the United Nations. The second amendment was to increase the architects' presence on site and for the provision of additional services, capped as a provisional amount of $65,000, to be paid only for services needed to expedite substantial completion through additional on-site assessments and review of critical construction activities, identification of strategies to achieve substantial completion, and the provision of daily status updates. The third amendment extended the construction stage after 6 April 2016 for the purpose of architectural services to be provided, with a maximum cap of $124,200, until substantial completion.

73. Pursuant to the full architectural services contract, the architects are to provide multiple services during the defect liability period, including inspecting the completion of the punch list; reviewing the operations and maintenance manuals; and providing a building performance evaluation report. At the end of the liability

period they will provide their recommendation regarding the final acceptance of the works by the United Nations.

VII. Project expenditures and costs

74. The total budget approved for the project amounts to $8,787,733 (inclusive of a contingency provision in the amount of $1,050,371). Substantial completion of the project was achieved within the total approved budget. The tables below show actual expenditure up to 31 December 2016 and projected expenditure during the remainder of the project. Actual and projected expenditures from 2013 to 2017 (excluding contingency) as well as expenditures against the contingency are detailed in the tables below.

Table 1

Disbursements and obligations for the period 2013-2017 (excluding contingency)

(United States dollars)

		Expenditures									
Description	*Approved*[a]	*2013*	*2014 actual disbursements according to 2014 financial statements*	*2015 actual disbursements according to 2015 financial statements*	*2016 interim disbursements as of 31 December 2016*	*2016 obligations to be disbursed in 2017*	*Projected expenditure from January 2017 until completion of the project*[c]	*Total expenditure*	*Deficit to be covered by contingency*	*Redeployment*	*Revised deficit to be covered by contingency*
	a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*	*f*	*g*	*h=(b to g)*	*i=(a-h)*	*j*	*k=(i+j)*
I. Construction[b]	**6 365 887**	–	**2 912**	**1 104 044**	**4 416 024**	**261 113**	**833 218**	**6 617 311**	**(251 424)**	–	**(251 424)**
II. Architect and project management											
Architect fees[b]	636 589	–	399 222	77 470	174 308	135 572	189 200	975 772	(339 183)	–	(339 183)
Project supervision and management[c]	635 800	155 919	143 172	154 582	159 200	–	–	612 873	22 927	(22 927)	–
Travel[d]	99 086	12 396	54 475	59 092	–	–	–	125 963	(26 877)	22 927	(3 950)
Subtotal, II	**1 371 475**	**168 315**	**596 869**	**291 144**	**333 508**	**135 572**	**189 200**	**1 714 608**	**(343 133)**	–	**(343 133)**
Total project cost (excluding contingency)	**7 737 362**	**168 315**	**599 781**	**1 395 188**	**4 749 532**	**396 685**	**1 022 418**	**8 331 919**	**(594 557)**	–	**(594 557)**

[a] Approved budget as presented in A/67/696, annex II.

[b] Reflects the cost of hiring an external architectural consultant firm to produce detailed construction documents, perform construction administration duties and assume the responsibility of the architect of record.

[c] Reflects the cost of hiring a project manager for the day-to-day management and coordination of project activities.

[d] Reflects the cost of the travel of staff between New York, The Hague and Arusha to provide technical assistance to the project.

[e] Corresponds to the portion of the contract not obligated against the 2015-2016 budget to be obligated in 2017.

Contingency provision and expenditures against the contingency

Table 2

Breakdown of contingency provisions and expenditure for the period 2013-2017

(United States dollars)

	Approved contingency[a]	*Expenditure against contingency*				*Total remaining contingency*
Description		*2015*	*2016*	*2017*	*Total*	
	a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e=(b+c+d)*	*f=(a-e)*
I. Construction[b]	**954 883**		**251 424**		**251 424**	**703 459**
II. Architect and project management[c]						
Architect fees	95 488	64 272	85 711	189 200	339 183	(243 695)
Project supervision and management	–	–	–	–	–	–
Travel	–	–	–	3 950	3 950	(3 950)
Subtotal, II	**95 488**	**64 272**	**85 711**	**193 150**	**343 133**	**(247 645)**
Total	**1 050 371**	**64 272**	**337 135**	**193 150**	**594 557**	**455 814**

[a] Approved contingency provision as presented in A/67/696, annex II.

[b] Calculated at 15 per cent of the construction costs and architect fees.

[c] Architect's amendment 2 in the amount of $65,000 and amendment 3 in the amount of US$ 124,200.

Use of contingency

75. On the basis of lessons learned from other capital projects, and in line with industry best practice, the General Assembly approved, as proposed by the Secretary-General, a contingency provision of $1,050,371, representing 15 per cent of the estimated project cost.

76. A total of $594,557 in expenditures is expected to be charged to the contingency fund. This amount represents an increase of $278,861 as compared with the estimate of $315,696 reported in the previous report of the Secretary-General. The difference is mainly due to additional requirements to cover: (a) the extended project supervision and management due to the slower-than-expected progress, and (b) the fees for additional and extended architectural services required pursuant to the second and third contractual amendments described above, with a view to expediting substantial completion and to extending the services of the architects through to substantial completion due to the slower-than-expected progress.

77. These drawdowns are in line with industry best practice and also with the Board of Auditors' recommendation that contingency is a specific budgetary provision allocated to address expeditiously the cost impact of project risks, should they arise, without the need to delay the project and request increased funding. A robust analysis was undertaken by the project team, in close consultation with the Office of Legal Affairs and the Office of Central Support Services, before entering into these contractual amendments. This analysis considered, in particular, the following circumstances:

(a) The amendments were concluded in full adherence with the United Nations procurement guidelines. The monetary value of these amendments was consistent and in line with the fees at the 2013 rate under the existing contract;

(b) Other options were unsuitable, including rebidding at a critical phase of the construction and use of internal resources which would have entailed, among other things, potential issues regarding the professional liability for the project;

(c) The use of contingency remained within the appropriated overall budget and within the intended use of contingency provisions.

78. As of substantial completion, the project contingency provision had a projected balance of $455,814. The unused portion of the contingency provision, including any unencumbered balance against the projected expenditures for 2017, would be taken into account and reported in the context of the second performance report on the budget of the Mechanism for the biennium 2016-2017.

79. As the approved scope of the project has now been delivered, no further drawdown of the project contingency funds is foreseen.

Efficient allocation of resources

80. The consistent commitment of the Secretary-General to allocating resources in the most effective manner and to seeking efficiencies, pursuant to paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 70/258, helped to ensure that the project was completed within the overall budget.

81. During the reporting period, six change orders, mostly related to minor adjustments based on the actual site conditions, were issued, in line with best practices in capital projects that change orders should be kept to a minimum. By offsetting them with opportunities for savings, none of the issued change orders resulted in additional costs to the project. Additionally, all change orders followed the procedure adopted by the project team, which strictly adheres to the provisions of the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations and the United Nations Procurement Manual, and incorporates oversight mechanisms.

82. During the reporting period, the Mechanism also continued to actively engage with the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia regarding the reuse of existing assets which resulted in savings and efficiencies. The transfer of the assets of the International Criminal Tribunal was concluded during the reporting period, with the end of the liquidation team of the International Criminal Tribunal. The Mechanism has received from the International Criminal Tribunal, since the commencement of its Arusha branch, $7.8 million worth of assets. Of this amount, $5.6 million reflects the value of assets that have been specifically used at the new facility. This includes office furniture, as well as office, security and information technology equipment.

VIII. Actions to be taken by the General Assembly

83. **The General Assembly is requested to take note of the present report.**

Annex I

Architectural design rendering of the new Arusha premises of the Mechanism, 2014

New Arusha premises of the Mechanism as at substantial completion, 1 December 2016

Annex II

Project schedule

Project schedule for the new facility of the International Residual Mechanism for Criminal Tribunals, Arusha branch, as of December 2016

Activity	2014	2015				2016			
	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Tender for construction contract									
Contract negotiations, award and mobilization									
Construction and interior fit-out									
Occupancy									

Legend:

SG Report A/70/696

Actual progress

Occupancy

United Nations A/71/754–S/2017/57

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
20 January 2017

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-first session
Agenda items 32 and 37

Security Council
Seventy-second year

Protracted conflicts in the GUAM area and their implications for international peace, security and development

The situation in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan

Letter dated 19 January 2017 from the Permanent Representative of Azerbaijan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I would like to draw your attention to the latest provocation by the armed forces of the Republic of Armenia along the State border with the Republic of Azerbaijan.

On 12 January 2017, an explosive device consisting of an electric detonator, a detonation cord, a large amount of shrapnel and batteries for activation was identified in the territory of the Tovuz district of the Republic of Azerbaijan, in the vicinity of the State border. The explosive device, prohibited under the relevant international instruments, was thrown into the area by an unmanned aerial vehicle belonging to the armed forces of the Republic of Armenia and was aimed at targeting both the civilians residing in the area and the servicemen of the armed forces of the Republic of Azerbaijan deployed there.

This is not the first instance of such despicable acts by the Armenian side; it is in addition to numerous grave violations of international humanitarian law amounting to war crimes, crimes against humanity and acts of genocide committed by its armed forces and subordinate military and paramilitary formations in the course of the conflict.

Suffice it to recall what happened on 14 July 2011 in the village of Alibayli of the same Tovuz district of the Republic of Azerbaijan, bordering with the Republic of Armenia. That day, as a result of the blast of an explosive device built in a toy, a 13-year-old Azerbaijani girl, Aygun Shahmaliyeva, was killed and her 32-year-old mother, Elnara Shahmaliyeva, was seriously wounded. The toy stuffed with an explosive device was found by the victim in the Tovuz River, which springs from the territory of Armenia and flows through the village of Alibayli. The booby-trap

Please recycle

toy was made in Armenia, was dropped in the river intentionally and its target was children of the neighbouring Azerbaijani settlements (see A/65/915-S/2011/457).

Against the background of its persistent refusal to engage in substantive and result-oriented negotiations on the resolution of the conflict, the recent provocative action of throwing an explosive device by an unmanned aerial vehicle, which was resorted to by the Armenian side two weeks after an attempted incursion by its armed forces through the State border into the territory of the Republic of Azerbaijan (see A/71/740-S/2016/1140), is yet further proof of Yerevan's deliberate attempts to increase tensions, escalate the situation on the ground and obstruct the peace process.

As we have repeatedly stated, the only way to achieve a durable and lasting solution is to ensure the immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of the Armenian armed forces from the Nagorno-Karabakh region and from other occupied territories of Azerbaijan. That is what international law and the relevant Security Council resolutions demand. The implementation of that peremptory obligation, which emanates in accordance with Article 2 (4) of the Charter of the United Nations from the principle of non-use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any State, can in no way be conditioned, introduced as a compromise or used as a bargaining chip in the conflict settlement process.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 32 and 37, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Yashar **Aliyev**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative